



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

term after reading is begun) a short amount of the reading lesson for thorough analysis with regard to pronunciation and grammar. Point out relations between French and English, and generally draw the student's attention to higher standards of knowledge. By degrees, as reading becomes easier, and grammar drill can be relaxed and left, dwell on stylistic and other literary merits. When the lessons begin to be rather long to be rendered line by line into English, read, or have the class read, the French alone, asking for a translation only of uncommon words and difficult passages, enough to control the correctness and earnestness of the student's preparation. And, finally, if you have a speaking command of the language, begin to speak French to the class as soon as it can be safely done without waste of time. But do this only gradually where the class can follow you without wasteful explanations; and do not, as a rule, require the students to answer in French, because that means, with ordinary classes and under ordinary circumstances, frustrating the main purpose of your instruction for more trivial ends.

Valuable suggestions on the method of teaching French may be found in *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages*, addresses and articles by various instructors. [pp. 185; 60 cents; Heath & Co.]

A. H. Edgren

University of Nebraska, Oct. 1894

THE CURRICULUM OF A SMALL HIGH SCHOOL

In constructing a programme of studies for a small high school a very important consideration is the well-being of the teacher. It is true, of course, that the school is not maintained for the sake of the teacher; but it is likewise true that those communities that disregard the personal welfare of their teachers do not have, and can not have, the best schools. In view of this, it is not unreasonable, as a preliminary to the discussion of the main proposition of this paper, to ascertain and clearly state the conditions under which a teacher in a

small high school may carry on his work in a normal and successful manner.

My first thesis is that the teacher must not be overworked. He must be a sturdy and persistent worker, but he must not be overworked. The schoolmaster who allows his nervous system to be upset and his spirits broken by carrying too heavy and unreasonable burdens, commits a wrong, not only against himself, but also against his school. No remuneration is great enough to compensate a man for loss of health; and no teacher whose blood lacks oxygen or whose nerve centres lack what Dr. Hall calls "euphoria" is qualified to instruct or train a healthy and vigorous youth. The teacher should have time for abundant physical exercise in the open air, and for such recreation as affords him needful rest and pleasure. This is not only his right but his duty. Children are as soft clay in the hands of a teacher who possesses an abundance of vitality and good nature. But how many teachers in the village high schools of New England can even approximate such a condition? As a class they are seriously overwrought. They spend their days in the most harassing kind of labor in the school room and their nights in tutoring some ambitious pupil, or in preparing for the six, seven, eight or more recitations that must be conducted the next day. The debilitating effects of such a life are easily discernible. No one should wonder that such teachers are nervous, irritable, and despondent. If young men of ambition and ability are to be induced to enter the small high schools and remain in them, this stress and strain of overwork that depresses the spirits and impairs the health of conscientious and faithful teachers should be removed.

My second thesis is that the teacher in the small high school should have his work adjusted in such a way that he may thereby and meanwhile be making suitable preparations for a position of larger responsibility and more substantial remuneration. Every good teacher is an ambitious one. The small high schools secure a high order of talent, and often

the most efficient and skillful service, simply because the wide-awake teacher looks to the future, and believes that transfer and promotion are sure to come to him whose work from day to day evinces both wisdom and fidelity. In this view the small high schools are the training ground where men and women are prepared for more responsible duties and wider fields of activity in the larger centres of population. Fortunately for the small high schools that this is so, and the communities in which these schools are placed will consult their own interests when they see to it that the men and women, who serve them so efficiently at small salaries, shall have some reasonable opportunity to prepare themselves for the larger work that waits those who survive this period of their probation.

What then are the conditions under which a man teaching in a small high school may prepare himself for a larger sphere of school work, and at the same time do the full measure of his duty to the school in which he obtains his preparation? The answer to this question is a twofold one: The teacher should have time to acquire some breadth and accuracy of scholarship in the subjects which he attempts to teach, and should have opportunity to study both theoretically and practically the problems of education and the most approved methods of instruction. These two statements may be summed up in one: The successful teacher must be both learned and wise.

The teacher who is thoroughly saturated with his subject is the one to whom pupils listen with attention and respect. He it is who wastes no time on non-essentials, but puts the emphasis of his own instructions and his pupils' efforts where it is most needed. Mr. Collar, of the Roxbury Latin School, on his return to this country after a somewhat careful study of the German gymnasium, said in substance: "The chief defect in our secondary schools is the poor scholarship of our teachers." "We American teachers," he said, "do not know enough about the subjects which we profess to teach." He might have added: nothing is so destructive to good scholarship among

American teachers as the necessity of teaching half a dozen, or more, subjects on the same day or in the same year. A curriculum of wide range in a small high school inevitably precludes scholarly teachers. Therefore since the good quality of the school is so dependent upon the scholarship of the teacher, the most serviceable course of studies for such schools is the one which is carefully, but rigorously, limited in the number and range of the subjects to be taught.

Furthermore, that a teacher who is hard pressed with the cares of the school and has a large number of subjects to teach, can give any thing more than a cursory attention to the philosophy of his work is out of the question. The teacher should not only have time for observation and reflection concerning the phenomena that appear from day to day in the class room ; but he should have leisure also for careful reading and close study, if he is to understand in any good degree the real significance of the work that he is attempting to do. Men of course differ about this, and there are some who go so far as to say that there is no such thing as a philosophy or science of education. But all will agree, I believe, in the notion that those who direct the education of children and youth need to know something about the characteristics of human nature ; something about the different effects that a study of the several classes of subjects, such as language, literature, history, science, and mathematics, has upon the human mind ; and something about the form and nature of the civilization under which they live, and for which their pupils are to be trained and instructed. This is what I mean when I say that the truly successful teacher must be a "wise" man. Such wisdom is not inherited and cannot be imparted ; it comes only from the attentive study and profound reflection of men of experience. Of course ultimate knowledge along these lines of investigation is not to be expected ; but we must all admit that real progress in educational science depends upon the successful prosecution of these three departments of study. When we know what human nature is, we shall agree as to the proper function of the school.

When we understand the effects of the several subjects of study upon the child's mind, we shall know the best means of education. When we fully realize the essential qualities of modern civilization, we shall be better able to judge of a pupil's power to conform to it and thrive under it. It may be urged that this study of the philosophy of education is more or less speculative, and I admit it. And still it is better to make slow progress by an uncertain light than to grope in utter darkness. But however fundamental or important these problems may be, the teacher of the small high school cannot be expected to give them serious attention so long as his time and strength are wholly absorbed in the work of the class room and in preparation for it. Thus far an attempt has been made to present, from the stand-point of the teacher, some reasons why great care should be taken to restrict the number of subjects to be taught in a high school that has only two or three teachers.

It is believed that the same proposition can be maintained when presented from the point of view of the school and the community which the school serves. It is manifestly better for a youth to study a few subjects with a good degree of fullness and thoroughness, than to study many subjects briefly and superficially. The Committee of Ten report upon this point with no uncertainty. On page 41 they say: "The fundamental conception of all the conferences" was "that all the subjects which make part of the secondary school course should be taught consecutively enough and extensively enough to make every subject yield that training which it is best fitted to yield." Again on page 42 they say: "It is essential that each principal subject shall be taught thoroughly and extensively." "If in a secondary school Latin is steadily pursued for four years, that subject will be worth more to the pupil than the sum of half a dozen other subjects, each of which has one-sixth of the time allotted to Latin." "If every subject is to provide a substantial mental training, it must have a time-allotment sufficient to produce that fruit." I know of nothing more fundamental or valuable in the whole report than this. It disposes in a sen-

tence of all sciences that can be taught in "14 weeks," and throws overboard without ceremony all subjects that are studied only or mainly for information. Subjects that yield interesting and valuable information, but a small measure of training, may be maintained as luxuries in large and well-manned high schools, but should be rigorously excluded from the small schools. In a limited curriculum only those subjects should be admitted, that afford information *and training*, since training is, to say the least, the equal of information, as a factor in education.

It is interesting to note that only a few of the whole number of subjects contained in the four courses of study recommended by the Committee of Ten, are to be studied less than a year. If you except higher algebra and trigonometry, which constitute a group to be studied a year, the subjects that are to be studied less than a year, that is, a half year, are astronomy, physiology, meteorology, geology, and physiography. When the instruction is based chiefly upon the text book, these five subjects just mentioned may also be classed with studies that are pursued for the sake of information, and should not be admitted into the programme of studies of the small high school. The objection to them is removed, of course, if the teacher has had special training in them, and is prepared to direct his instruction "quite as much towards a training in the methods of logical investigation, as towards imparting information." For obvious reasons, "anatomy, physiology, and hygiene" may be rated as an exception to the general law just laid down, if they have not been studied in the grammar school.

In the four sample programmes found in table IV. of the report of the Committee of Ten, it is instructive to observe that several subjects, which often have a prominent place in the high school curriculum, do not appear. What are the subjects that have been discarded by these famous decemviri? They are civil government, political economy, psychology, ethics, logic, drawing, music, elocution, book-keeping, commercial arithmetic, and commercial law. To be sure, they

say by way of apology for such seeming disrespect, that "it must not be supposed that the omitted subjects are necessarily to be neglected," and they go on to show how some of them, such as drawing, ethics, metaphysics, economics, etc., come in for "incidental instruction;" but the significant fact remains that these subjects do not appear at all in their "four sample programmes." The obvious inference is that, in the judgment of the Committee, they have only a secondary educational value. Although I have a special interest in some of these discarded subjects, yet I believe that the Committee of Ten were wise in their decision to exclude them from their sample programmes.

President Eliot said in one of his lectures before the Lowell Institute a year or two ago, that modern education is characterized more and more by the efforts that are made to develop the power to do as well as to know, the power to apply what one knows to new problems and new conditions. In reading a foreign language without a vocabulary, in solving fresh problems in algebra, in working out original demonstrations of propositions in geometry, in making observations and inferences in the field or laboratory, in applying the canons of criticism to the masterpieces of literature, and in writing out one's thoughts clearly and logically we have good illustrations of the processes by which the pupil develops power while he acquires new knowledge and culture. Studies which develop the power to do as well as power to know should, without question have the precedence in making up a curriculum in which the number of subjects to be taught is to be rigidly restricted.

We now approach the most perplexing problem of this whole discussion. Should the high school that has only two or three teachers attempt to prepare boys and girls for college? There are weighty reasons both pro and con. It must of course be recognized at the outset, to use the words of the Committee of Ten, that "the secondary schools of the United States do not exist for the purpose of preparing girls and boys for college." And yet, there are benefits, both direct and in-

direct, that can come to a village high school in no other way.

In the first place it brings the teachers into contact with the college, a contact that generates both heat and light, inspiration and guidance. When a teacher's work is to be tested by the examination of a college expert, or by the proficiency in study of pupils from his school who have been admitted to college by certificate, he looks about himself as never before. He now plans his work with his utmost care and skill, scrutinizes every method to ascertain its efficacy, directs his pupils' efforts along the lines that are most productive, and stimulates them to their best efforts that they may win honor for themselves and distinction for the school; in short, he leaves no stone unturned to make his work sound and successful. The good results of these activities of the teacher are felt in a large degree by all the school. It may be urged that clearsighted and honorable men and women will do their best for a school without the aid of any such stimulus, but any man of experience in the management of schools recognizes at once the unsoundness of this statement.

Again there are a few superior boys and girls in every village that may be saved to the higher education and prepared for careers of larger usefulness, if the local high school furnishes an incentive and a preparation for it without expense.

And again, if the village high school does not prepare its pupils for college, the brightest and most ambitious boys and girls are frequently withdrawn and sent away to other schools. This alienates the patronage and, naturally, the sympathetic support of the most influential families of the community and deprives the school of its natural leaders, girls and boys who have inherited intellectual and studious tendencies, and whose attendance would establish the confidence of the community in the school, and exercise a beneficent influence upon other pupils who may be less richly endowed and less aspiring.

Furthermore, to be able to send boys and girls directly from the local high school to college is a source of gratification to any community, and this reacts to the advantage of the school,

especially when the graduates return from college and take their places as men and women among those who patronize and support the school.

On the contrary, as I have said, there are weighty reasons why the small high school should not expend its valuable time and strength upon a curriculum designed primarily for pupils preparing for college. The greatest good to the greatest number is quite generally recognized as a sound policy in the management of public schools. If there be one curriculum containing Greek for the few who prepare for college, and another for the many who do not, even if the two curricula are identical in several important subjects, justice cannot be done to the many while so much attention is given to the few.

Notwithstanding the great advantages incident to maintaining a successful college-preparatory course, there are other and, I believe, greater advantages, both to the community and teacher, to be derived from a carefully planned and well sustained general course. The possibilities in this direction are very great, and may well excite the ambition of any teacher, or enlist the enthusiastic support of an intelligent school committee.

Take for instance the study of English, using the word in its broad sense to include the language, the literature, and practice in composition. In each of the four sample programmes presented by the Committee of Ten there is a four years' course in English. What an opportunity for a teacher who has a wide acquaintance with good literature and knows how to teach it ! The intellectual stimulus and moral inspiration that can be given to a school, and, through a school, to a community, by imparting to high school girls and boys a genuine and lasting interest in good literature, are well worthy of the consecrated efforts of the most devoted teacher. So, too, in directing pupils' efforts in English composition, the wise efforts of the faithful teacher, like the seed that falls on good ground, "bring forth fruit, some thirty, some sixty, and some an hundred fold."

History, too, is made quite prominent in the sample programmes just mentioned. In three of them it appears as a three years' course, and in the English programme, as a four years' course. The great educational value of the proper study of history in the secondary school is more highly appreciated every year, and the methods of teaching it are improving with great rapidity. No study can be made more fascinating, and none is more useful in training young men to meet their responsibilities as intelligent citizens of a free State. To collect a working library of historical works so that pupils may to some extent have access to original and authentic sources of information ; to make a series of suggestive topics that shall comprehensively cover the periods to be studied ; to be well enough informed to indicate to pupils the best and various sources of information on important historical epochs ; to be able in dealing with historical data to cultivate the pupil's power of careful and systematic inquiry, and to establish in him the habit of logical inductive and deductive reasoning, to do all this with wisdom and enthusiasm for a whole school is just as creditable and quite as productive of good to the community, as to teach Greek to two or three girls and boys.

Likewise in physics and chemistry there are possibilities of effective training in quantitative laboratory work that must be abandoned, if the teacher's attention is absorbed in maintaining the traditional college-preparatory course. How much this laboratory work has improved in value during the last seven years under the leadership of Harvard college need not be recited here. There are reasons for believing that this more accurate, and therefore more effective, method of quantitative experimentation in the laboratory will soon displace a part, at least, of the less accurate and therefore less valuable qualitative laboratory work that now quite generally prevails. A young man just entering upon his career as a teacher would make no mistake for himself or for the community which he serves, if he should enter upon this new scheme of

school work with a view of demonstrating its full value as an instrument of education. The idea to be emphasized is this: Such desirable possibilities, as have been instanced, in the departments of English, history and science, that may accrue if the whole strength of the teachers be spent in developing one first-class general course, must be relinquished, if Greek and the higher mathematics comprise a part of the curriculum, and if the best efforts of the teachers be given to preparing pupils for college. I must not be understood as decrying the study of Greek. Far from it. As an instrument of culture the Greek language has no superior. As a means of interpreting the phenomena of modern civilization and correcting its evil tendencies, Grecian philosophy and Grecian history are well-nigh indispensable. But, in a secondary school of only two or three teachers, that which appears to be a good thing for the few, must sometimes be sacrificed for what is really the greatest good of the many.

The main propositions that I have tried to support thus far in this discussion are chiefly negative in their character, and may be briefly expressed as follows: The course of study of a small high school having only two or three teachers, should contain a minimum number of subjects of study; should exclude all studies that are pursued mainly for information; should admit but few, if any, short courses; should bar out Greek and the higher mathematics, and should be framed primarily in the interests of the many and not for the few that go to college.

When we turn to the affirmative side of this question, and attempt to show just what studies should be admitted to such a curriculum, where each should be placed, and to what extent each should be pursued, fixing at the same time the number of exercises per week, we not only enter upon the discussion of a subject about which wise men disagree, but also of one that involves the greatest perplexities and uncertainties. In such a dilemma we may wisely and confidently follow the lead of the Committee of Ten. Their "four sample programmes" represent the mature outcome of all their inves-

tigation, thought, and discussion, and are well worthy of careful analysis and comparison. The first of the four is the so-called "classical course" containing Greek, and must therefore be set aside. The third programme is characterized by the large amount of time given to German and French, and for this reason would not generally be acceptable to New England people. Having rejected the first and third, our choice lies between the second, the "Latin Scientific," and the fourth, the "English." That the Committee believes the English course to be inferior to the Latin Scientific is evident from the following excerpt from the report: The Committee "desired to affirm explicitly their unanimous opinion that the two programmes called respectively Modern Languages and English must in practice be distinctly inferior to the other two." The English course contemplates the formation of classes in Latin, French, or German, prescribes trigonometry and higher algebra with no alternative, and gives one-fourth more time to English and one-half more time to history than is demanded in the Latin Scientific course. If the English programme were preferred, it would have to be cut down to much smaller proportions, and then would not differ essentially from the Latin Scientific course, except that two foreign languages, Latin and German or French, are prescribed for the latter. This fact alone makes me hesitate to pronounce in favor of the Latin Scientific course. Is it practicable to attempt to require every pupil in the school to study two foreign languages? If this question can be answered in the affirmative, I shall not hesitate to declare the Latin Scientific to be the most satisfactory general course that I have ever seen in print. Of course a school having only two teachers, can not afford the costly luxury of providing twenty exercises a week for its pupils, as recommended by the Committee of Ten; the number must be reduced to fifteen. If there were three strong teachers in the school, possibly the Latin Scientific course might stand intact, with the proviso that some of the subjects be rated as electives. But for a school of two teachers, it seems necessary to exclude from the

Latin Scientific course physical geography, botany or zoology, astronomy and meteorology, trigonometry and higher algebra, geology and physiography, and to reduce somewhat the amount of time given to history and English. Abridged in this manner the Latin Scientific programme of studies would stand as follows :

FIRST YEAR.

Latin,	.	.	.	5 p.
English,	.	.	.	3 p.
Algebra,	.	.	.	4 p.
History,	.	.	.	3
				<hr/>
				15

SECOND YEAR.

Latin,	.	.	.	5 p.
German or French,	.	.	.	4 p.
Geometry,	.	.	.	3 p.
Physics,	.	.	.	3 p.
				<hr/>
				15

THIRD YEAR.

Latin,	.	.	.	4 p.
English,	.	.	.	3 p.
German or French,	.	.	.	4 p.
Algebra,	.	.	.	2 p.
Geometry,	.	.	.	2 p.
				<hr/>
				15

FOURTH YEAR.

Latin,	.	.	.	4 p.
English,	.	.	.	2 p.
German or French,	.	.	.	3 p.
Chemistry,	.	.	.	3 p.
History,	.	.	.	3 p.
				<hr/>
				15

This scheme would provide an excellent general course, and at the same time would enable the school to prepare boys for the course of study at Dartmouth college leading to the degrees of B. L. and B. S. ; a course leading to the degree of A. B. at Williams college ; a course leading to the degree of B. S. at Amherst college ; courses leading to the degrees of Ph. B., C. E., and M. E. at Brown University ; and a course at Wesleyan University leading to the degree of Ph. B. In like manner girls may be prepared to enter upon courses of studies leading to the degree of A. B. at Vassar and Wellesley ; and courses leading to the degree of B. L. at Smith and Mount Holyoke.

On account of the modifications in college requirements for admission, made during the last three or four years, a fairly comprehensive or satisfactory general course may be an acceptable college-preparatory course. The time has happily come when a small high school can retain all the great benefits to be derived from preparing girls and boys for college, and at the same time devote all the resources of the school to the

training and culture of those who are graduated from the high school to enter immediately upon the duties of active life.

Edward J. Goodwin

Newton, Mass.

THE MORAL PROBLEM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

If the supreme test of life is the unintermittent adaptation of the organism to its surroundings, then we must feel that in the intellectual life of man, or in the existence of the institutions which embody his ideals, critical opposition is a factor to be freely reckoned with as one of the forces tending to ensure the preservation of the fittest forms alone. This applied to our public school system means that we recognize it as something flexible and adaptable, not cast in any mould of rigidity, but capable of adjustment as need may arise, and as legitimate criticism may point out.

But there is some criticism that is not legitimate, or at least, is not fair and scientific, being based on misapprehension. Such, it may be safely said, is the attack which has been made on our system of public schools as not only non-moral in structure, but positively immoral in its effects. Such a charge is too important to be passed over lightly. If true, or if partly true, we may look only for a future of national disaster and ruin such as history tells us is the inevitable result when right conduct is lost sight of by any people.

This much may be conceded to the criticism, that the implied demand is just. Our schools must indeed be not only storehouses of prepared facts, to which, as to Mr. Bellamy's collective dininghalls, children are to be sent to get their mental provender; they must be also places formative of character. It is rightfully demanded that the places where our future citizens and mothers of citizens are being trained, shall afford the certainty of the child obtaining the moral and ethical schooling necessary for good citizenship.